

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 43408/43409

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2016 Unpublished Opinion No. 516
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: May 4, 2016
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
BRODY MCEWEN TROUT,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Twin Falls County. Hon. G. Richard Bevan, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and sentences, affirmed.

Nevin, Benjamin, McKay & Bartlett, LLP; Deborah Whipple, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before MELANSON, Chief Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and HUSKEY, Judge

PER CURIAM

In 43408, Brody McEwen Trout pleaded guilty to unlawful possession of a firearm, felony, Idaho Code § 18-3316, and the district court imposed a determinate five-year sentence to run concurrently with his sentences in 43409. In 43409, Trout pleaded guilty to possession of a controlled substance, methadone, felony, I.C. § 37-2732(c)(1), and two counts of robbery, felony, I.C. §§ 18-6501, 18-6502, and the district court imposed a determinate five-year sentence and two unified life sentences, with eight years determinate, respectively, with the sentences running concurrently.¹ Trout appeals, contending that his sentences are excessive.

¹ At the sentencing hearing, the district court ordered a determinate five-year sentence for the unlawful possession of a firearm and for the possession of a controlled substance, methadone,

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Trout's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.

with the sentence to run concurrently. The judgment of conviction incorrectly states the sentences are each five-years indeterminate.